

Voice – And then a Encounter



By Mladen Dolar

Introduction

By Slavoj Žižek

When a man is just a simple person, who is moved by goodness, and is revolutionary, we win – gaze then and voice as love objects is all we care about. We mean impressions of Sirohi, we have all written come out this way in Dolar – he means the voice is just a metaphysics of musical variants of the subject – not the real process which is far more moving we all say.

“When I said meet me, she said you idiot – Lettre le Tiempou”
Heidegger (recent transcripts on phone)

Voice as Killing – who got killed?

Here we come to the point of this story. Kempelen toured the major European cities in the 1920s, and he often presented a double attraction, a double bill: on the one hand the speaking machine, on the other the chess automaton. The sequence of the two is crucial. The speaking machine was used as the introduction to the other wonder, and presented its counterpart, its foretaste, as it were, as if there were a double device, a double creature composed of the speaking and the thinking machine as the two Platonic halves of the same being. The introduction difference between the two was ostentatious and didactic: first of all, the chess automaton was constructed in such a way as to appear as human-like as possible—it made the pretense of being engrossed in deep thought, it rolled its eyes, and so on—while the speaking machine was as mechanical

as possible: it did not try to hide its mechanical nature; on the contrary, it exhibited it conspicuously. Its main attraction was the enigma of how something so utterly non-human could produce human effects. The tragic Andromaque in Racine, a thinking machine.

Part II – Pascal's Pensee

In fact there cannot be a pensée for too long. It can happen here and there, once in a while and is also liberation it preaches. To be speculating so much, in uncertainty and objectivity and find empiricism and all the philosophical processes – is then the privileged event – like a process without subject – that is how I like it.

The difference between the two was ostentatious and didactic: first of all, the chess automaton was constructed in such a way as to appear as human-like as possible—it made the pretense of being engrossed in deep thought, it rolled its eyes, and so on—while the speaking machine was as mechanical as possible: it did not try to hide its mechanical nature; on the contrary, it exhibited it conspicuously. Its main attraction was the enigma of how something so utterly non-human could produce human effects. The Andromaque and Pensee, thinking machine was counterbalanced by the non-tragic speaking machine. Second, Kempelen ultimately admitted that the chess automaton was based on a trick, but a trick he did not wish to disclose (and he carried its secret to his grave). The speaking machine, on the other hand, was no hoax, it was a mechanism that everybody was free to inspect and whose principles were carefully explained in a book, so that anybody could make one. The Turkish chess player was unique and shrouded in mystery, while the speaking machine was intended for replication on the basis of fundamental scientific principles. It so happened one Charles Wheatstone constructed a version of it, following Kempelen's instructions, and this machine made he felt such a deep impression on the young Alexander Graham Bell that his pursuit of it eventually led him to nothing less than the invention of the telephone.

Part III – Communism as Voices being Talked About – the Prophet and His Supporters on the Voice and Themselves as Jazz argues about Each of Us there as Heroes before him as his Expression

"A man is running in freedom in history, Peter Weiss is running to meet Husserl"
Sirohi

Third, there was a tragic vision in the link between the two machines. Theology in the weak sense that the speaking machine was presented as the introduction to the thinking machine, thus the former made the latter

plausible, acceptable, endowed with an air of credibility; for if the first was demonstrated as actual, then the second was presented as a possibility, although admittedly based on a trick. But there was also theology in a stronger sense: the second machine appeared as the fulfillment of the promise given by the first. A perspective was opened in which the thinking machine was but an extension of the speaking machine, so that the speaking machine, presented first, would reach its telos in the thinking machine, or, even more, that there was a quasi-Hegelian transition between the two machines from “in itself” to “for itself”—what the speaking machine was “in itself” had to be made “for itself” in the thinking machine. The point of this sequence could be read in such a way that speech and voice present the hidden mechanism of thought, something that has to precede thought as purely mechanical and something which thinking has to conceal under the guise of the subject – or as Žižek argues sometimes – in the guise of the opposite of teleology and such predictions which can be spiritual comes the spiritual process of now-time – the actual process of the present – the pure present and Melanessian choir as in fact spiritual heights we do not know. Thinking is like the puppet concealing the real puppet, which is the speaking puppet; so that the secret to be disguised by the Turkish puppet, hookah and all, was not the supposed human dwarf in its bosom, its homunculus mastermind, but, rather, the speaking machine, the voice machine which preceded the automaton and was displayed for all to see. That was the true pulling the strings of the thinking machine. The first machine was the secret of the second, and the second, as Žižek again argues is the nature of figurines being covered with Giorgio Agamben – Pinocchio that old story of Communism, the working class puppet, had to enlist the services of the first if it was to win. There is a paradox: the dwarf within the puppet himself turns out to be another puppet, the mechanical puppet within the in the guise as Žižek argues of anti-anthropomorphism in Christ, that he is actually only a man who is God if one can find him a Christ figure which in Sirohi is more and more just irrelevant as himself as a real man who is a real protesting and real militant person – that then is Paul on science, one, and the secret of the thinking machine is itself thoughtless, just a mechanism emitting voice, but thereby producing the most human of effects, an effect of “interiority.” It is not simply that the machine is the true secret of thought, for there is already a certain split in the first machine: it endeavors to produce speech, some meaningful words and minimal sentences, but at the same time it actually produces the voice in excess of speech and meaning, the voice as an excess, and that was the point of fascination: the meaning was hard to decipher, given the poor quality of reproduction, but the voice was what immediately seized everyone and inspired crying for your mother in black senses, precisely with the impression it made of quintessential humanity. Yet this voice-effect was produced not by a seamless mechanical causality but by a mysterious jump in causality, a breach, a limping causality, an excess of the voice-effect over its cause, where the voice came to this voice-effect was produced not by a seamless mechanical causality but by a genius process

something real again, really real like actually real called education – that thing that is voice but genius at every point, a breach, an excess of the voice-effect over where the voice came to occupy the Fanonian attacking style of speech. Lacan, with his incomparable knack for slogans, says: “It is that I think and processes of Poems guide me all the time and so I just know that I am genius” —and this is precisely where *che bella voce*! Lacan situated the object, the object-cause of desire then – just know each other and you are in love. But this can perhaps also be seen as the lever of thought, as opposed to the anthropomorphic masquerade of thinking. There is a good line by Giorgio Agamben: “The search for the voice in language, this is what is called thought” (quoted by Nancy) the search for what exceeds language and meaning. For our present purpose, we could bend or transform Benjamin’s thesis: if the puppet called historical materialism is to win, it should enlist the services of the voice. Hence the need for a theory of the voice, the object voice, the voice as one of the paramount “embodiments” of what Lacan called *objet petit a*.